

# Request for Offers (RFO) Addendum

RFO Number: \_\_\_\_RFO0094\_\_\_\_

Addendum Number: \_\_\_\_1\_\_\_\_

Date of Addendum: \_\_10/8/2015\_\_\_\_

Original Due Date, Time: \_\_10/9/2015 2:00pm\_\_

Revised Date, Time: \_\_10/9/2015 2:00pm\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_Annual Audits for Criminal History System Replacement\_\_\_\_

## SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

The following are questions and answers to the RFO:

Q. The Business Need section of the RFO indicates that the work is to ensure compliance with the statute requiring annual audits. The Deliverables section describes the first of the two audits in scope of this RFO is to be conducted “beginning on the start date of the contract”, and that the second one will be in July 2016. Can the Department please verify that the first of these will result in the “Final Report for the 2015 audit” and the second of these will result in the “Final Report for the 2016 audit”, and that no further audits will be required as part of this RFO?

A. Correct

Q. Based on the sprint schedule, it is safe to assume that approximately 12 sprints will have been completed before the “2015” audit will begin, and that approximately 21 sprints will have been completed before the “2016” audit will begin?

A. Correct

Q. May we assume that the highest risk functionality is planned for development and delivery in the earlier sprints, and functional risk will gradually decrease as the sprints progress?

- o This assumption is based on the following statement was found in the last paragraph of the Requirements section of the RFO: “The State seeks to balance the effort and cost to perform the audit and the likelihood of actionable recommendations that will significantly improve the probability of project success.”
- o If the response to Question 3 is yes, based on the assumption that the highest risk items are completed earlier in the project and 2/3 of the project is projected to be completed before the “2016 audit” begins (thus fewer actionable recommendations may be identified in the “2016 audit” than found in the “2015 audit”), does the Department expect that the cost of the second audit will be less than the first audit?

A. In general the project has worked high business value, high risk, and technical dependencies first. The new criminal history system will provide many capabilities beyond the current system’s capability. We have defined an initial release that includes the capabilities required to allow decommissioning of the current system, with follow on releases to add enhanced capabilities. The initial release is targeted for late 2016. This means there are items of significant risk that will not be worked on until later in the project.

It is not required that both annual audits be the same cost.

Q. Can the Department please clarify what is meant by “for-Auditor-only documents” in Section 2 (bullet 2) under the Requirements section?

A. These could be forms, questionnaires, or other documents produced at the request of the audit team.

Q. Do we need to provide a PM and a BA to be considered? Or can we submit one strong resource?

A. Responses that do not include both a PM and a BA will be considered. Respondents should propose a team with the experience and background to produce a valuable result. As stated, the State is concerned about a process that is a single person’s opinion.

Q. Can you explain what an alternative approach may be when it comes to fixed cost?

A. All proposals must present a total fixed cost to the audit. If the respondent has an alternate methodology or optional steps that may add cost that they think the State may be interested in, they are welcome to propose it. The total cost of the alternate approach must be clear and listed only in the cost proposal.

Q. Are there specific skills, outside of ‘assessing, mentoring, or auditing project’, ‘executing projects, or the Agile experience that are seen as specifically important to this engagement?

A. If there are specific skills required to execute the proposed methodology, this would be considered important.

Q. Is there an incumbent auditor to this engagement? To DPS’ other large engagements?

A. No

Q. Since this audit spans over two years and is a periodic review of the program, is it reasonable to submit a list of key resources and representative supporting resources?

A. Responses must identify the key resources who will perform the first audit. These key resources may be replaced during the contract with concurrence by the State that the replacement resources have the required skills.

Q. Please clarify under section 5 ‘Cost Proposal’ item #2 and #3 ‘Alternate Approaches. If this is a fixed bid requirement, what are the alternate approaches that would qualify for submission?

A. See response to #6 above.

Q. Please clarify under section 5 ‘Cost Proposal’ item #4. Is the State expecting the vendor to submit hours worked during a fixed bid engagement?

A. No – it helps understand how the bid was prepared and who will be participating and to what extent.

This addendum shall become part of the RFO and should be returned with, or acknowledged in, the response to the RFO.

RESPONDER NAME:

SIGNATURE:

TITLE:

DATE: